



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/789,536	02/26/2004	Arthur M. Krieg	C1039.70083US05	9640
7590	03/30/2009		EXAMINER	
Helen C. Lockhart, Ph.D. Wolf, Greenfield & Sacks, P.C. 600 Atlantic Avenue Boston, MA 02210			MINNIFIELD, NITA M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1645	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/30/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/789,536	KRIEG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	N. M. Minnifield	1645	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 January 2009.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 37 and 39-56 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) 37,39-44 and 47-53 is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 45,46 and 54 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 55 56 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
- Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submissions filed on January 12, 2009 and September 24, 2008 have been entered.
2. Applicants' amendment filed February 25, 2008 is acknowledged and has been entered. Claims 1-36 and 38 have been canceled. Claim 39 has been amended. Claims 37 and 39-56 are now pending in the present application. All rejections have been withdrawn in view of Applicants' amendment to the claims and/or comments, with the exception of those discussed below.
3. It is noted that pending claims (37 and 39-56) have been examined.
4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.
5. The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical

Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

6. Claim 46 is are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hutcherson et al (5723335) as evidenced by Gura et al (Science, 1995, 270:575-577).

The claim is directed to a method for stimulating a subjects response to a vaccine comprising administering an immunostimulatory oligonucleotide adjuvant as a vaccine adjuvant with the vaccine to the subject (human) to stimulate the subject's response to the vaccine, wherein the immunostimulatory oligonucleotide comprises a phosphate backbone modification and an unmethylated cytosine-guanine dinucleotide, wherein the oligonucleotide is at least eight nucleotides in length.

Hutcherson et al discloses a method of stimulating an immune response in a subject comprising administering to the subject an immunostimulatory oligonucleotide and a therapeutic (i.e. vaccine) can be administered to animals or humans (abstract; cols. 5-6). It has now been found, surprisingly, that oligonucleotide analogs having at least one phosphorothioate bond can induce stimulation of a local immune response. This immunostimulation does not appear to be related to any antisense effect (i.e. stimulation does not result from an antisense mechanism), which these oligonucleotide analogs may or may not possess. These oligonucleotide analogs are useful as immunopotentiators (i.e.

adjuvant), either alone or in combination with other therapeutic modalities, such as drugs, particularly anti-infective and anticancer drugs, and surgical procedures to increase efficacy (cols. 4-5). It has also been found that oligonucleotide analogs having at least one phosphorothioate bond can be used to induce stimulation of a systemic or humoral immune response. Thus, these oligonucleotides are also useful as immunopotentiators of an antibody response, either alone or in combination with other therapeutic modalities (i.e. vaccine). (col. 5) "The oligonucleotide analogs of this invention are used as immunopotentiators (i.e. adjuvant). For therapeutic or prophylactic treatment, oligonucleotide analogs are administered to animals, especially humans, in accordance with this invention. Oligonucleotides may be formulated in a pharmaceutical composition, which may include carriers, thickeners, diluents, buffers, preservatives, surface active agents and the like in addition to the oligonucleotide. Pharmaceutical compositions may also include one or more active ingredients such as antimicrobial agents, anti-inflammatory agents, anesthetics, and the like in addition to oligonucleotides. The pharmaceutical composition may be administered in a number of ways depending on whether local or systemic treatment is desired, and on the area to be treated. Administration may be done topically (including ophthalmically, vaginally, rectally, intranasally), intralesionally, orally, by inhalation, or parenterally, for example by intravenous drip or subcutaneous, intraperitoneal, intradermal or intramuscular injection. It is generally preferred to apply the oligonucleotide analogs in accordance with this invention topically, intralesionally or parenterally. Formulations for topical administration may include ointments, lotions, creams, gels, drops, suppositories, sprays, liquids and powders. Conventional pharmaceutical carriers, aqueous, powder or oily bases, thickeners and the like may be necessary or desirable.

Compositions for oral administration include powders or granules, suspensions or solutions in water or non-aqueous media, capsules, sachets, or tablets. Thickeners, flavorings, diluents, emulsifiers, dispersing aids or binders may be desirable.”

(cols. 7-8) Hutcherson et al discloses that liposomes and cationic lipids can significantly enhance the uptake and fate of oligonucleotides and analogs as well as phosphate backbone modifications such as phosphorothioate (col. 8).

Hutcherson et al discloses the synthesis of oligonucleotides, which are unmethylated as evidence by Gura (antisense oligonucleotides that are synthesized are unmethylated, see p. 576). The prior art anticipates the claimed invention.

The rejection is maintained for claim 46 for the reasons of record.

Applicant's arguments filed September 24, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. “Applicant would like to clarify that the operability of the Hutcherson et al patent is not an issue and was never challenged by the Applicant. Instead, Applicant maintains the argument that Hutcherson et al does not teach the skilled artisan to prepare and administer to a human a vaccine including a CpG dinucleotide containing oligonucleotide. Hutcherson et al does not teach that the key component of the immunostimulatory oligonucleotide is an unmethylated CpG dinucleotide. Thus the reference does not provide an adequate teaching to anticipate the claim. If the rejection is based on inherency, the teachings still do not anticipate the claim because the reference does not disclose an example of a vaccine containing a CpG oligonucleotide to a human. Thus, claim 46 is novel in view of Hutcherson et al. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.” (Remarks, p. 6)

Although previously stated, it is noted that a US Patent is presumed valid and enabled. Since every patent is presumed valid (35 U.S.C. 282), and since that presumption includes the presumption of operability (Metropolitan Eng. Co. v. Coe, 78 F.2d 199, 25 USPQ 216 (D.C. Cir. 1935), examiners should not express any opinion on the operability of a patent. Affidavits or declarations attacking the operability of a patent cited as a reference must rebut the presumption of operability by a preponderance of the evidence. In re Sasse, 629 F.2d 675, 207 USPQ 107 (CCPA 1980).

Further, since in a patent it is presumed that a process if used by one skilled in the art will produce the product or result described therein, such presumption is not overcome by a mere showing that it is possible to operate within the disclosure without obtaining the alleged product. In re Weber, 405 F.2d 1403, 160 USPQ 549 (CCPA 1969). It is to be presumed also that skilled workers would as a matter of course, if they do not immediately obtain desired results, make certain experiments and adaptations, within the skill of the competent worker. The failures of experimenters who have no interest in succeeding should not be accorded great weight. In re Michalek, 162 F.2d 229, 74 USPQ 107 (CCPA 1947); In re Reid, 179 F.2d 998, 84 USPQ 478 (CCPA 1950).

Hutcherson et al is used for all that it discloses. Hutcherson et al discloses the claimed invention, How to prepare and administer to a human a vaccine including a CpG dinucleotide containing oligonucleotide. It is noted that Hutcherson et al does disclose an oligonucleotide containing a CpG dinucleotide, see for example SEQ ID NO: 1-3 of Hutcherson et al.

Hutcherson et al discloses a method of stimulating an immune response in a subject comprising administering to the subject an immunostimulatory

oligonucleotide and a therapeutic (i.e. vaccine) can be administered to animals or humans (abstract; cols. 5-6). These oligonucleotide analogs are useful as immunopotentiators (i.e. adjuvant), either alone or in combination with other therapeutic modalities, such as drugs, particularly anti-infective and anticancer drugs, and surgical procedures to increase efficacy (cols. 4-5). It has also been found that oligonucleotide analogs having at least one phosphorothioate bond can be used to induce stimulation of a systemic or humoral immune response. Thus, these oligonucleotides are also useful as immunopotentiators of an antibody response, either alone or in combination with other therapeutic modalities (i.e. vaccine). (col. 5) “The oligonucleotide analogs of this invention are used as immunopotentiators (i.e. adjuvant). For therapeutic or prophylactic treatment, oligonucleotide analogs are administered to animals, especially humans, in accordance with this invention. Oligonucleotides may be formulated in a pharmaceutical composition, which may include carriers, thickeners, diluents, buffers, preservatives, surface active agents and the like in addition to the oligonucleotide. Pharmaceutical compositions may also include one or more active ingredients such as antimicrobial agents, anti-inflammatory agents, anesthetics, and the like in addition to oligonucleotides. The pharmaceutical composition may be administered in a number of ways depending on whether local or systemic treatment is desired, and on the area to be treated.

With regard to Applicants’ assertion that Hutcherson et al does not teach that the key component of the immunostimulatory oligonucleotide is an unmethylated CpG dinucleotide, it is the examiner’s position that Gura et al is provided as evidence that the oligonucleotides that are synthesized are unmethylated. Therefore, since Hutcherson et al discloses oligonucleotides that have a CG

dinucleotide, then the immunostimulatory oligonucleotide does have an unmethylated CpG dinucleotide.

7. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

8. Claim 45, 46 and 54 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 45 of copending Application No. 11/127797. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they both claim method of inducing (stimulating) the immune response of a subject to a vaccine comprising the vaccine and immunostimulatory oligonucleotide (unmethylated CpG, at least 8 nucleotides in length and has a phosphate backbone modification) and administering the composition.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

The rejection is maintained for claim 46 for the reasons of record. Applicant's arguments filed September 24, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants have asserted that the rejection is a provisional one since claim 45 in the 11/127,797 application has not been found allowable. If the cited claim is found allowable, Applicants will address the rejection. It is noted that this rejection will be maintained until the instant application is found to be in condition for allowance or the claims amended to overcome the rejection.

9. Claims 55 and 56 are objected to because of the following informalities: they depend from rejected claim 54. Appropriate correction is required.

10. Claims 37, 39-44 and 47-53 are allowed.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to N. M. Minnifield whose telephone number is 571-272-0860. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:00-5:30) Second Friday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert B. Mondesi can be reached on 571-272-0956. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

N. M. Minnifield
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1645

/N. M. Minnifield/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1645
March 26, 2009